

## Memorandum

**Date:** November 14, 2013

**To:** Ken Wiseman, Parks Forward Initiative

**From:** Eric Poncelet, Ben Gettleman, and Kelsey Rugani, Kearns & West

**Re:** Parks Forward Initiative – Summary of Public Workshop Findings

---

This Findings Memorandum presents our summary findings from ten public workshops conducted in September and October 2013. The workshops were convened by the California State Park and Recreation Commission on behalf of the Parks Forward Initiative (PFI). The purpose of the public workshops was to educate the public on the PFI and for members of the public to share their perspectives and ideas around key issues being addressed by the PFI, including meeting the needs of all Californians, financial sustainability, and effective partnerships.

This document represents a synthesis of major themes that emerged from across the public workshops; it is not intended to represent a comprehensive list of comments provided. Section I describes the public workshop format and organization, Section II presents the overarching findings from the workshops, and Section III presents key findings organized by major discussion topic.

Over 400 participants attended the public workshops in total. Participants represented a broad range of interests and perspectives, and included representatives from local, regional, state, and federal governments and park systems, state park partners and concessionaires, local businesses, non-government organizations (NGOs), students, researchers and educators, representatives from park user groups, and other interested parties. The workshops were held in diverse locations throughout the state; the dates and locations are shown in the table below:

Date	Location
September 9, 2013	Santa Cruz
September 10, 2013	Fresno
September 11, 2013	San Luis Obispo
September 30, 2013	Eureka
October 2, 2013	San Rafael
October 3, 2013	Auburn
October 14, 2013	San Diego
October 15, 2013	Inland Empire
October 16, 2013	Orange County
October 17, 2013	Los Angeles

Note on nomenclature: this document uses “State Parks” to refer to the agency and “state parks” to refer to the actual parks themselves.

## I. Public Workshop Format and Organization

The public workshops were organized into three main parts (see Appendix A for a typical workshop agenda):

- *Overview of the PFI.* PFI staff presented overview information of the Parks Forward Initiative, and members of the public were provided with the opportunity to ask clarifying questions.
- *Public input to inform the PFI.* This was the main agenda item. Public input in the workshops was organized around three main themes: 1) meeting the needs of all Californians, 2) sustainable funding, and 3) effective partnerships. The workshop included separate public comment periods for each theme. To inform the public input, workshop organizers provided topic and focus questions for consideration. These questions represented topics of keen interest to the Parks Forward Commission and are listed in the next section below. Workshop organizers also invited guest speakers to the workshops to speak to each theme as a way of seeding and stimulating public comment. A list of invited guest speakers who presented at each workshop is shown in Appendix B.
- *Open house.* Members of the public had the opportunity to ask questions and continue discussions with State Park Commissioners, PFI staff, and State Parks staff in an informal open house setting.

Workshop participants were also invited to provide additional written comments following the workshop via the PFI website ([www.parksforward.com](http://www.parksforward.com)), email (to [info@parksforward.com](mailto:info@parksforward.com)), or mail (Parks Forward Initiative, California Natural Resources Agency, 1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1414, Sacramento, CA 95814). Participants were also invited to complete and hand in written comment forms at the workshops themselves.

### Topic and Focus Questions

The topic and focus questions shared with the workshop participants to help inform public comment are listed below.

#### ***Theme: Meeting the Needs of All Californians***

Topic question: What is working well, what is not working well, and what key improvements could be made to ensure state parks better meet the needs of all Californians in your region?

Focus questions:

- a. How would you characterize those groups currently using the state parks in your region, and those groups of potential park visitors that are underserved and under-represented today by your state parks?
- b. What types of parks or park services, facilities, programs, and activities are required to meet the needs of both existing and future visitors?
- c. Under what conditions and by what criteria should any new State Parks be created or new acreage added to existing state parks?

**Theme: Sustainable Funding**

Topic question: What should be done to ensure the long-term financial sustainability of State Parks?

Focus questions:

- a. Should State Parks aim for self-sufficiency, or should it always receive some dependable level of support from the state? If the latter, what State Park functions merit at least some state funding?
- b. What is the right mix of funding sources for State Parks among those available, including general fund, taxation, user fees, service and concession revenue, corporate, and philanthropy?
- c. What specific, significant opportunities are there to reduce costs, increase revenues, or otherwise prioritize spending within State Parks?

**Theme: Effective Partnerships**

Topic question: What are the opportunities for improving and/or expanding use of alternative operating arrangements that could enhance visitor experiences while improving long-term financial sustainability of State Parks?

Focus questions:

- a. What is working and what is not working in existing park operating partnerships and cooperative management arrangements in your region?
- b. What are the most appropriate roles and functions for partners to perform relating to operation of State Parks?
- c. What can State Parks do to better support and manage effective operating partnerships?

## II. Overarching Findings

In the ten public workshops throughout the state, participants expressed a wide variety of views, concerns, and recommendations with regard to the future of State Parks. This section highlights some of the major findings that emerged from across the workshops or discussion themes (these are listed in no particular order). Additional findings organized by discussion theme are detailed in Section III below.

- **Financial sustainability requires a diverse mix of funding sources with dedicated state funding.** Participants at all of the public workshops advocated strongly for State Parks to draw from a suite of funding sources, noting that no one source such as the General Fund will be sufficient. Many participants acknowledged, however, that finding the right mix remains a key challenge. Potential funding sources mentioned included: tax revenues, bond funding, park fees, philanthropic funding, and concession revenues. Another broadly held view was that, given the statewide benefits of state parks, the state should be responsible for funding core state park functions (safety, natural resource protection, and interpretation were commonly mentioned). This recommendation came with a caveat for some participants, who cautioned against over-reliance on state funds based on recent past budget deficits.
- **Partnerships are key to State Parks' success.** Workshop participants across the state emphasized the critical role that effective partnerships can play in helping State Parks

become financially sustainable and meet the needs of all Californians moving forward. Participants highlighted key benefits of partnerships, including financial benefits (i.e., they help reduce costs and bring in revenues); supplementing State Parks staff capacity (e.g., through the use of volunteers); bringing in knowledge, expertise, and creativity; and increasing connection to local communities. Participants described successful (or “true”) partnerships as those: where there is a shared vision and goals, where each partner is empowered and has equal benefits, where coordination is consistent and communication is a “two-way street,” where partners support each other and everyone’s interests are achieved, where all partners feel a strong sense of ownership, and where accountability and transparency are built into the partnering relationship. Successful partnerships require expertise, investment, and commitment. There was a general sentiment among the workshop participants that State Parks could use volunteers to even greater effect.

- **Long-term success requires meeting the needs of California’s evolving populations.** Participants emphasized that if State Parks is to be successful moving forward, it needs to be *relevant* to the citizens it is serving, who will be more urban and non-white in the future. A key challenge described will be meeting the needs of presently underserved and underrepresented populations. Participants pointed out that certain parts of the state—such as the Central Valley and many urban areas, particularly in southern California—are underserved by state parks (i.e., are “park poor”) relative to other parts of the state. Participants also pointed out that relatively few state parks are located proximate to urban areas and ethnic populations, which constitute the most densely populated areas of California. With regard to these equity issues, participants identified a suite of embedded challenges that State Parks will need to address in order to continue to be relevant in the future. These included: ensuring parks are affordable to lower income groups, effectively reaching out to youth, providing sufficient access to state parks, addressing cultural and language barriers, making visitors feel safe, addressing the needs of the disabled, and addressing the lack of knowledge that exists about state parks.
- **Opportunities lie in meeting the needs of diverse user groups.** A related common theme heard in all of the workshops is that many potential user groups are currently restricted in their use of state parks. Among the user groups seeking increased use opportunities who spoke at the public workshops were: dog owners, mountain bikers, naturists (seeking use of clothing-optional beaches), horseback riders, youth, outdoor recreationists, vehicles-on-beach users, mushroom hunters, and photographers, among others. These participants made the case that State Parks could see increases in visitation by better accommodating their needs. At the same time, these participants also acknowledged that with increasing park uses comes inevitable user conflicts, and that State Parks will need to be committed to and creative in developing effective solutions to better address all of these needs.
- **No “one size fits all” solutions.** With regard to achieving financial sustainability and effective partnerships, workshop participants shared the view that there are no “silver bullet” or “one-size-fits-all” solutions. Participants made the case that individual parks need to have their own appropriate mix of funding, and most participants believed that individual parks should not be required to be financially self-sufficient. Similarly, different parks and different regions will require different types of partnerships. Participants advised that the appropriate structure for each and every partnership needs to be

determined by the local state park and the potential partners involved. Some participants provided a recommended approach, which is to first identify the needs of the state park, then assess the strengths of each partner, and then designate roles accordingly.

- **Importance of relationships with local communities.** A key to meeting the needs of all Californians is for State Parks to make parks more *local* by partnering more with local organizations (e.g., community-based organizations and schools) that are already serving local populations. This will help State Parks better meet the needs of local communities and will help build local pride and ownership in state parks. Many participants pointed to the strong connection between successful state parks and healthy local economies and vibrant communities. They also highlighted the importance of *personal* relationships and recommended that State Parks prioritize making these strong connections.
- **Need for improved marketing and outreach.** A key challenge discussed at nearly all of the workshops is that many Californians simply don't know very much about their state parks. Similarly, it was the view that many citizens (and legislators) are unaware of the value of state parks and the significant benefits they provide to all Californians, especially in the areas of public health, natural resource protection, and supporting local economies. Participants strongly argued for State Parks to improve its marketing and outreach efforts, noting that it is difficult to advocate for increased funding to the legislature without broad public support. Some participants said that State Parks needs to become more customer-driven and recommended conducting customer assessments. Other participants stated that marketing needs to be better tailored to local audiences and more effectively directed to urban populations. Local partnerships were again recommended as a key way of addressing improving marketing and outreach.
- **Rebuilding public trust through improved planning and management.** Another common theme concerned the need for State Parks to re-establish a more trusting relationship with the public. Many participants noted the loss of trust that has emerged due to recent budget issues and a general perception that state parks have not been sufficiently well managed. Participants recommended that State Parks take the necessary steps to improve the quality, accountability, and transparency of its financial management structures and processes. At the same time, they called for improved planning by State Parks as a critical and necessary to step toward achieving long-term goals and mission. These individuals recommended that State Parks expand its planning department and make greater use of strategic and/or business plans. Participants across the state also advocated for streamlining what they viewed as cumbersome bureaucratic processes (some of which are dictated by the Department of General Services) and encouraged greater use of flexibility, creativity, and leadership to help overcome these bureaucratic constraints.

### III. Key Findings by Theme

This section summarizes key findings from the workshop organized according to the main three discussion themes. This section highlights recurring comments heard but also describes some of the distinctive input that came from the individual workshops.

## A. Theme: Meeting the Needs of all Californians

Workshop participants provided a wide range of comments on how to best meet the needs of all Californians moving forward. Public comments on this topic are organized into the following sub-topics: 1) key challenges involved in meeting the needs of all Californians, 2) keys to success and recommended improvements, 3) key benefits of State Parks, and 4) conditions for creating new or expanding existing state parks.

### 1. Key challenges involved in meeting the needs of all Californians

- a. Being relevant to California's changing populations. A common theme heard in nearly every workshop was a reminder that the demographics of California will continue to change over the coming years, and to be relevant, State Parks will need to better target the changing populations, especially urban and non-white populations.
- b. Meeting the needs of the underserved and underrepresented. Another common theme expressed on this topic was the need for State Parks to better address the needs of underserved and underrepresented populations within California. This topic was often framed as an equity issue that State Parks must address to be *relevant* in the future. Participants pointed out that certain parts of the state, such as the Central Valley and many urban areas, are underserved by state parks (i.e., are “park poor”) relative to other parts of the state. Participants also pointed out that relatively few state parks are located proximate to urban areas and ethnic populations, which constitute the most densely populated parts of California. These were topics of particular concern at the Fresno and southern California workshops. With regard to these equity issues, participants identified a suite of challenges that State Parks will need to address in order to continue to be relevant in the future, including:
  - i. *Ensuring parks are affordable to lower income groups.* Participants noted that park access fees present significant negative incentives to these populations. Some fees risk making the parks seem “elitist.”
  - ii. *Effectively reaching out to youth.* Many participants pointed to youth as a key demographic to the future of State Parks.
  - iii. *Providing sufficient access to state parks.* Many state parks are not accessible by public transportation or are otherwise long distances from population centers. Several participants spoke to the need for more urban parks.
  - iv. *Addressing cultural barriers.* Participants noted that with changing demographics in California comes the need for State Parks to better focus its cultural and historical programming toward meeting the needs of the populations likely to be visiting the parks in the future (i.e., non-white populations).
  - v. *Addressing language barriers.* There are many Californians who don't speak English and who, as a result, have a more difficult time benefiting from the full services of state parks.
  - vi. *Making people feel safe.* A few participants pointed out that new generations of state park goers will not visit unless they feel that the parks are safe.

- vii. *Addressing the needs of the disabled.* Disabled citizens were also identified by some participants as a key underserved and under-represented community.
- viii. *Addressing the lack of knowledge that exists about state parks.* Many participants noted that many Californians simply don't know enough about their state parks and what they have to offer. As one participant framed it, the challenge facing State Parks is to "change non-aware, non-users into aware users."

A few individuals also noted that these equity issues are related to health disparities among different ethnic populations in California.

- c. Meeting the needs of diverse user groups. A common theme heard in all of the workshops is that many potential user groups are currently restricted in their use of state parks. Among the user groups seeking increased use opportunities represented at the public workshops were: dog owners, naturists (seeking use of clothing-optional beaches), mountain bikers, horseback riders, youth, outdoor recreationists, vehicles-on-beach users, mushroom hunters, and photographers, among others. These participants made the case that State Parks could see increases in visitation by better accommodating their needs. At the same time, these participants also acknowledged that with increasing park uses comes inevitable user conflicts, and that State Parks will need to be committed to and creative in developing effective solutions to better address all of these needs.
- d. Trust and accountability between State Parks and users. Another common theme concerned the need for State Parks to re-establish a trusting relationship with the public. Many participants noted the loss of trust that has emerged due to budget issues within the past few years and a perception that state parks are not being efficiently or effectively managed. These individuals recommended that State Parks take the necessary steps to improve its accountability and transparency in the eyes of the public.
- e. Making state parks welcoming again. Several participants pointed out that many state parks continue to be underfunded and poorly maintained and are still dealing with service reductions, and that more generally state parks are simply not welcoming enough. These individuals noted that the focus within many state parks seems to be more on restrictions and what the public can't do rather than what they can do for the public, and suggested that the resolution of this challenge requires both increased investment in state parks services and staff and a shift in attitude.

## **2. Keys to success and recommended improvements**

Participants in the public workshops made many recommendations for addressing the challenges summarized above. Among these recommendations were the following:

- a. Partnerships and collaboration with locals. A common theme expressed at all of the public workshops is that a key to meeting the needs of diverse populations is for State Parks to make parks more "local" and to partner more with local organizations (e.g., community-based organizations and schools) that are

already working with these populations. This will help State Parks better meet the needs of local communities and will help build local pride and ownership in state parks. Many participants highlighted the strong connection they perceived between successful state parks and healthy local economies. Others pointed to the critical importance of State Parks having strong, trusting, personal relationships with partners.

- b. Better marketing and outreach, including to underserved and underrepresented populations. The need for improved marketing was a common theme heard throughout the state. To address the needs of underserved and underrepresented populations and indeed all Californians, State Parks needs to better reach out to them about the benefits of their state parks and how to access them. Some participants said that State Parks needs to become more customer-driven and recommended conducting customer assessments. One participant stated: “State Parks needs to understand who is coming to their parks and why.” Other participants stated that marketing needs to be better tailored to local audiences and more effectively directed to urban populations. Ideas shared included marketing through: local radio and TV; soccer, churches and schools; and highlighting of water activities (e.g., lakes, fishing).
- c. Better service, investments, and sustainable funding. State Parks needs to make investments in services (e.g., maintenance, natural resource protection) and staffing. When citizens find that parks are no longer clean or safe, this becomes a disincentive to use the parks. Workshop participants acknowledged that providing consistent and high quality services will require sustainable funding sources, although they also acknowledged the important role that volunteers can play to supplement State Parks staff.
- d. Affordability and accessibility. More people will visit state parks in the future if the parks remain affordable, especially to lower income families, and if accessibility to parks (e.g., transportation opportunities) is improved. Many participants cautioned against increasing park fees, although some acknowledged that some fee increases may be appropriate in some strategic cases (e.g., to address specific uses that have costs associated with them—the beneficiary pays approach).
- e. Relevant parks and programming. Many participants made the case that more citizens will visit state parks in the future if they find them to be relevant, and this will depend greatly on the perceived relevance of the interpretive programming provided. Participants recommended increasing the cultural and historical resource programming targeted to non-white populations and youth, such as by better highlighting the role of Hispanics, African-Americans, and Asians in California’s history. Other participants advocated for improved multi-lingual signage in areas with large numbers of non-English speaking visitors. Still others mentioned the importance of State Parks staff being able to communicate effectively to park visitors in languages beyond English (especially Spanish, but other languages as well depending on the location of immigrant populations). Finally, given the role that state parks can play in improving public health, participants in several of the workshops recommended that State Parks better highlight the health care benefits associated with visiting state parks.

- f. Successfully addressing user conflicts. Any efforts to expand park uses will require successfully addressing associated user conflicts. Several participants recommended that State Parks create specific processes for dealing with user conflicts. One participant recommended creating an ombudsman position within State Parks; another suggested creating an advisory council.
- g. Addressing State Parks in the context of the broader park system. Many participants recommended that State Parks look for additional ways to collaborate with park organizations at the local, regional, and national levels as a way of more strategically meeting the needs of Californians in the future. There was a general feeling that many efficiencies and synergies could be derived from enhanced cooperation and planning among park organizations.
- h. Better planning, streamlined processes, and more flexible structures. In many of the workshops, participants advocated for improved planning by State Parks as a critical and necessary step toward achieving State Parks' long-term goals and mission. This was an especially popular topic at the San Luis Obispo workshop. These individuals recommended that State Parks expand its planning department and make greater use of General Plans. Participants across the state also advocated for streamlining what were viewed as cumbersome bureaucratic processes (some of which are dictated by the Department of General Services) and encouraged greater use of flexibility and creativity.
- i. Improved use and integration of technology. State Parks needs to strive to better incorporate opportunities afforded by new technologies. Some examples mentioned during the workshops included doing more marketing via the Internet and social media, partnering more with web-based organizations (e.g., a guest speaker from Surfline presented on this topic), and learning from start-up experiences in the high-tech sector.

### 3. Key benefits of State Parks

As workshop participants shared their views on what was working and not working in state parks and how to best to meet the needs of all Californians, many of them explicitly identified ways in which state parks are already meeting many of these needs. The benefits most commonly mentioned are listed below. Several participants noted that State Parks and its supporters need to better highlight these benefits when making the case for sustainable funding for state parks.

- a. Public health benefits. Participants in many of the workshops made the point that the significant public health benefits provided by California's state parks are greatly underappreciated and undervalued. These participants spoke to the significant mental and physical health benefits that can be achieved from children and adults spending time in open spaces, connecting more with nature and other people, and engaging in recreational activities.
- b. Natural resource protection benefits. In many of the workshops, participants highlighted the critical role they see State Parks playing with regard to stewardship and protection of the state's natural resources and heritage. These

individuals viewed state parks as a huge and underappreciated asset to all of California's citizens. Related to this, a few individuals also brought up current climate change challenges and spoke about the significant role that state parks are playing with regard to carbon sequestration.

- c. Local economic benefits. Another common theme in the workshops was the important connection that state parks have with local economies. These participants pointed out how small businesses and employment in local communities are closely tied to nearby state parks. The tourism, hospitality, and art sectors were commonly mentioned. This argument was made most clearly at the San Luis Obispo, Eureka, and Auburn workshops. Several of these participants also pointed to local economic hardships that have resulted from the recent downsizing or closures of state parks.

#### **4. Conditions for creating new or expanding existing state parks**

- a. Not much support for creating new State Parks at this time. The focus question about the conditions and criteria by which new state parks should be created was not addressed at many of the public workshops. However, when it was discussed, the general view was that State Parks needs to address its existing financial challenges before looking to add new parks to the system. Nevertheless, several participants did express the view that meeting the needs of all Californians will likely require bringing more parks to "park poor" areas in the future; the Central Valley and urban areas in Southern California were again commonly mentioned in this respect.
- b. Expanding existing state parks. Similarly, there was not much support at the workshops for expanding existing state parks. The few individuals who discussed the idea of expanding existing state parks approached it from an environmental perspective, noting that park expansion would be a key way to expand wildlife corridors. This point was most clearly expressed at the Orange County workshop.
- c. Possible models for creating new state parks. Representatives from the Tejon Ranch Conservancy and the Tejon Ranch Company presented their Tejon Ranch partnership as a potential model to consider for creating a new state park. They noted that if State Parks applied the Tejon Ranch "contractual park" model to a new park, it would build on the agency's key strengths (which were seen to be primarily in the areas of law enforcement and interpretation), and it would leverage the strengths of other partners to provide services in other areas (e.g., maintenance, conservation). The Tejon Ranch partnership is relying upon a zoning-based approach that allows for a working landscape.

#### **B. Theme: Sustainable Funding**

Participants provided comments on the topic of sustainable funding during that agenda item and also during discussions of the other two themes: meeting the needs of all Californians and effective partnerships. Public comments on sustainable funding are organized into the following sub-topics: 1) challenges to obtaining long-term sustainable funding, 2) keys to success, 3)

views on the appropriate mix of funding sources, 4) ideas to increase revenue, and 5) ideas to reduce costs.

## 1. Challenges to obtaining long-term sustainable funding

- a. Recent history of declining state funding. In their comments, workshop participants noted the challenges that State Parks has been facing due to declining state funding, including deferred maintenance, reduced levels of service, and diminished capacity to protect natural resource in the parks. Participants in a few different workshops also pointed out that once defunding has taken place, it is difficult to reverse this trend.
- b. Trust and accountability between State Parks and the public. Participants in several of the workshops shared that many members of the public have lost trust in State Parks and in government institutions more generally. Many participants mentioned recent State Parks budget issues and the associated lack of accountability as a particular source of this loss in trust. These participants noted that it is difficult to make the case for sustainable funding to the legislature or the public in this context.
- c. Lack of understanding of the value of State Parks. A comment heard across the workshops is that many citizens and businesses do not understand the value of state parks to local economies, California's natural heritage, and public health more broadly. These participants pointed out that it is hard to make the case for sustainable funding of State Parks in front of the legislature without broad public support.
- d. Parks less appreciated as a public good. A comment heard in several of the workshops is that many citizens are less appreciative or less aware of state parks as a public benefit. As one participant noted, "we have lost the idea that parks are a public good that the public should support."

## 2. Keys to success

Related to the challenges listed above, participants in all of the public workshops shared their views on the keys to successfully obtaining long-term sustainable funding. Among the keys to success mentioned were the following:

- a. Need for stable, reliable funding consistent with State Parks' values. Participants across the workshops were broadly supportive of State Parks receiving support from a stable, reliable funding source(s) that would not be susceptible to politics. Importantly, workshop participants did not call for a change in State Parks' mission; rather, participants expressed general support for the mission, stating that it just needed to be better implemented.
- b. Pursuing partnerships. Participants in all of the public workshops described the key role that partnerships (both public-private and public-public) can play in helping State Parks become financially sustainable. Participants emphasized the importance of collaborating with local partners, and some highlighted in particular the importance of better educating businesses to the economic and social value

of state parks (e.g., public health benefits, arts and culture as drivers of local economies). The tourism and hospitality sectors were often mentioned here. One participant noted that sustainability needs to be for both State Parks and local communities.

- c. Need for better financial management, transparency and accountability. Participants in most of the workshops commented on key improvements that need to take place within State Parks in the area of financial management, including improving the information available on budgets, costs, revenue, and the financial contributions of partners. In particular, participants stated that State Parks needs to better identify such things as: who is paying for what program (i.e., distinguishing among interested beneficiaries), the elasticity of fees, the impacts of users on natural resources and the environment, and who is being served by which parks. Participants also emphasized the need for State Parks to better prioritize its funding to meet the needs of both individual user groups, broader communities, and the state as a whole. In some of the workshops, participants specifically recommended that State Parks create business or strategic plans to improve management and decision-making and to provide for improved oversight. A few participants suggested that State Parks find partners to help with this, and one mentioned potentially partnering with California public university business schools. A few others suggested looking to the National Parks system as a potential business model to emulate. Participants also noted that improved transparency and accountability were critical to rebuilding trust with the public.
- d. Improved marketing. There was broad support across the workshops for State Parks to improve its marketing by better communicating the value of state parks to the public, and especially to urban populations. Participants viewed this as a critical way of building public support for increased funding of State Parks.

### **3. Views on the appropriate mix of funding sources**

Key findings from public comments on the appropriate mix of funding sources include the following:

- a. Strong support for dedicated state funding of core functions. A strongly held view expressed at all of the workshops was that the state should be responsible for funding core state park functions (safety, natural resource protection, and interpretation were commonly mentioned), and some participants added that these functions should be performed by trained professionals rather than volunteers. Many referred to this as a necessary “safety net.” This recommendation came with a caveat for some participants, who cautioned against over-reliance on state funds based on recent past budget deficits.
- b. Diverse suite of funding sources. Participants at all of the public workshops advocated strongly for State Parks to draw from a suite of funding sources, noting that no one source such as the General Fund will be sufficient. Many acknowledged, however, that the key challenge is to find the right mix. Potential funding sources mentioned included the following:

- i. *General Fund.* Many participants across all of the workshops believed that State Parks should receive more money from the General Fund, and there was a generally held view that State Parks is currently underfunded by the legislature. These participants viewed this as a state responsibility.
  - ii. *Other taxes/fees.* Participants also generally supported appropriate use of other taxes and fees, and often pointed to the vehicle license fee as a successful source of stable revenue for other agencies.
  - iii. *Bond funding.* Participants were broadly supportive of bond funding as a key component of the funding mix, and some of them provided advice on how to successfully run a bond measure. See section B.3.d below.
  - iv. *Park fees.* While many participants saw park fees as continuing to have a role in the funding mix, a common view expressed at nearly all of the workshops was the importance of keeping fees low so as to avoid disenfranchising low income families. A few participants suggested that State Parks remove all fees, but the more common view was to keep them. As one participant noted: “people do not value what is free.” Finally, some user group representatives noted that there are user groups (e.g., naturalists, cyclists, dog walkers) that may be willing to pay more money to increase their access to state parks.
  - v. *Philanthropic funding.* Participants noted that State Parks should continue to establish partnerships with non-profits who are adept at bringing in philanthropic funds.
  - vi. *Partnerships, concession revenues, and corporate sponsorship.* Participants viewed partnerships as a key way of supplementing State Park staff and services, and they viewed concession revenue as an important part of the funding mix. A small number of individuals recommended pursuing more corporate sponsorships, but this elicited responses from several others who cautioned that State Parks’ mission and values are not always shared by corporate partners.
- c. No “one-size-fits-all solution”. Participants at all of the workshops expressed the general view that there is no “silver bullet” or “one-size-fits-all” funding approach that will be appropriate to all state parks, and that each park should have its own appropriate mix of funding. One individual stated that individual parks should be treated as “niches” in this respect. Most participants who spoke on this topic believed that individual parks should not be required to be self-sufficient, although a few advocated for the benefits of having individual parks striving for self-sufficiency.
- d. Keys to securing more state and bond funding. Participants at several of the workshops provided advice on how to more successfully increase State Park funding Parks from taxes or bond measures. Some argued that citizens are less willing to donate to the agency than they are to specific projects, and these participants recommended framing any bond measures accordingly. Others noted that the public is tax weary and will need to be convinced that state parks are wise investments of their tax dollars. Still others advocated that any bond measure or fee proposal needs to clearly resonate with personal and local interests.

#### 4. Ideas to increase revenue

Workshop participants recommended a variety of ways by which State Parks could increase revenues, although many cautioned that revenue generation needs to be consistent with the State Parks mission. Key recommendations included the following:

- a. Increase funding or investment from the public. As noted above, there was general support among workshop participants to increase funding for core services through the general fund or bond funding. There was also some support for increasing funding through measured tax increases (one person advocated for a 0.25% income tax increase on all Californians).
- b. Pursue more partnerships with businesses and philanthropic organizations. Participants generally viewed partnerships with private companies and non-profit organizations as key ways of bringing in additional funds, either through concessionary revenues or philanthropic fundraising. Several participants across the state expressed concern, however, about the potential over-commercialization of parks.
- c. Issue more permits. Several participants made the case that State Parks could increase revenues by increasing funds raised via permits. Potential sources of permit revenue mentioned included: special events like festivals, concerts and weddings; the film industry; and photographers, among others.
- d. Invest in success. Several participants at various workshops made the point that State Parks needs to invest in its own success if it wants to increase revenues. These participants made that case that, if State Parks made investments in addressing deferred maintenance and building new infrastructure, this would help bring more people into the parks.
- e. Cater to more user groups to bring in more visitors. As noted above, several user groups identified themselves as willing to pay special fees in exchange for increased access to parks, following a user beneficiary pays model. Among the user groups advocating for this approach were dog owners (especially in Santa Cruz and Los Angeles), bike riders, naturists, and horseback riders.
- f. Pursue marketing through new technologies. Participants throughout the state noted that State Parks should incorporate new technologies, especially web-based technologies, to better market its parks. For instance, some suggested developing new apps that could be used to provide discounts, park maps, or walking audio tours.
- g. Take a strategic approach, but be creative. Several participants recommended learning from past successes within State Parks or elsewhere in the state. A number of participants mentioned the State Vehicular Recreation Areas currently funded by off highway vehicle fuel fees as a successful way of bringing in revenue to support OHV activities within State Parks. A few recommended examining the ideas from past revenue enhancement efforts like the Phoenix program in the 1990s. Others pointed to other partnership models that have been successful in increasing revenue, such as the partnership between the National

Park Service (Golden Gate National Recreation Area) and the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy (e.g., redevelopment of the Presidio). Still others advised State Parks to avoid closing those parks or terminating other services (e.g., campgrounds) that have a track record of generating revenue. In addition to these ideas, participants advised State Parks to “think outside the box” and be creative in its revenue generation approaches. Along these lines, one participant at the Orange County workshop recommended selling one-foot-by-one-foot plots of land within state parks in an “adopt a park” sponsorship model to build ownership.

## 5. Ideas to reduce costs

Key cost reduction recommendations included the following:

- a. Partner with non-profits and make effective use of volunteers. A common view expressed across the workshops was that State Parks can reduce costs by working effectively with partners that can take on some of State Park’s non-core functions (e.g., fee collection). Many workshop participants were themselves state park volunteers, and they spoke to the significant resource available with volunteers who are willing to give their time, energy, and passion in support of State Parks.
- b. Better financial management. Several participants recommended that State Parks improve its financial management systems as a way of cutting costs. One recommendation was for State Parks to institute a budgeting system that ensures that money is allocated in the most cost-effective manner.
- c. Address potential state agency redundancy and increase efficiencies. A recommendation for reducing costs was to reduce potential state agency redundancy. Many of these comments, especially at the San Luis Obispo workshop, focused in particular on addressing perceived redundancies between State Parks and the California Coastal Commission. Other participants commented more broadly that State Parks could save money by increasing efficiencies, such as by streamlining cumbersome permitting, planning, and administrative processes.
- d. Increased investment in parks to meet a baseline level of service. A few participants made the case that State Parks could reduce costs by investing more in its parks. These individuals argued that proactive, routine maintenance and strategic investments in infrastructure would help reduce maintenance costs in the long run.
- e. Other cost cutting measures. Participants throughout the state offered additional money saving ideas. These included, as examples, improving water conservation, making greater use of solar energy, and switching to LED light bulbs.

## **C. Theme: Effective Partnerships**

Many of the workshop attendees were affiliated with current or previous partners with the State Parks system. They represented the general view that partnerships are critical to the success and sustainability of State Parks. Public comments on this topic are organized into the following sub-topics: 1) benefits of partnerships, 2) challenges to successful partnerships, 3) keys to successful partnerships, 4) potential models to learn from, and 5) opportunities for new partnerships.

### **1. Benefits of partnerships**

In their comments on partnerships, workshop participants from across the state spoke about the important benefits that partnerships can bring to State Parks. Key partner benefits mentioned included the following:

- a. Provide financial advantages. Participants noted several ways by which partnerships can provide financial benefits to State Parks, including costs savings (e.g., by volunteers assuming some of the tasks of paid State Parks staff), revenue generation (e.g., by working as concessionaires), and fundraising (e.g., by applying for grants from philanthropic organizations).
- b. Supplement staff capacity. Participants stated that having diverse partners increases State Parks' flexibility and capacity with regard to staffing decisions. There was a commonly held view expressed in many of the workshops, however, that partners should not perform the core functions more appropriately done by State Parks staff. Public safety, natural resource protection, and interpretation and education were the most commonly cited core functions.
- c. Bring in knowledge and expertise. Many participants also pointed out that partners bring not only additional capacity to the operation of state parks, but they also bring valuable knowledge, skills, and experience, and serve as sources of new ideas and creativity. A few participants also noted that by partnering with State Parks, volunteers also learn more about the parks they support and are therefore better able to represent them and State Parks to the public.
- d. Make a connection to local communities. Participants described a series of ways by which partners help individual state parks better connect with local communities—a role found to be critical to the success of parks. In particular, relationships between state parks and their local communities help with outreach and marketing to potential park-goers and build visitorship, they build local ownership in the local state parks, and they are key in building trust between State Parks and the state's citizens. Workshop participants throughout the state recognized that local partnerships will be a key way of reaching out to and better serving presently underserved and underrepresented populations, especially youth.

### **2. Challenges to successful partnerships**

In their comments on the topic of effective partnerships, workshop participants shared their view on things that were not working so well in partnerships with State Parks. They

often framed these difficulties in terms of challenges. Key challenges described included the following:

- a. Diversity of partners. Participants pointed out that State Parks is dealing with a great diversity of partners, both non-profit and for-profit.
- b. Effective relationships. Perhaps the most commonly cited challenge concerned the challenge of having effective relationships between State Parks and their partners, especially at the local level. These challenges can take several forms. Participants often described how many partnerships are viewed by the partners as being unequal, with State Park managers being unwilling to give up control and their partners feeling as though they were of lesser importance. Participants also spoke often about how critical it is to have consistent and effective communications between parks and their partners. A few participants alluded to the “culture clash” that can exist between State Parks and certain partners, especially entrepreneurs. Several participants acknowledged that, ultimately, many problems associated with partnerships are personality driven.
- c. Bureaucratic constraints limit flexibility. Another commonly mentioned challenge facing partnerships stemmed from what many participants described as limited flexibility and cumbersome processes that characterize some partnerships with State Parks. These participants pointed to difficulties they had experienced with contracting and with insurance and liability issues. Most placed the blame on bureaucratic constraints dictated by agencies like the Department of General Services (DGS). A few suggested that the law enforcement culture within State Parks may also be a source of this lack of flexibility and willingness to “think outside of the box.”
- d. Accountability and transparency. Some participants described the challenges in ensuring accountability and transparency within partnerships. These participants noted that partners need to be accountable for their funds. Others noted that accountability and transparency may be easier in partnerships between public agencies than between State Parks and private partners, where State Parks may not feel the same compulsion to share information.
- e. Consistency with State Parks’ mission and values. A challenge that was often described in relation to partnerships with for-profit organizations was the potential lack of shared interests. The primary concerns of these participants was that the for-profit partners would not take the actions necessary to uphold the education, stewardship, and cultural resource protection elements of State Parks’ mission if this conflicted with their own profit motives.
- f. Potential confusion over responsibility and authority. While many participants were primarily concerned about a lack of equality in partnerships with State Parks, several others pointed out that conflict often arises from a lack of clarity around issues of responsibility and decision-making authority.
- g. “Silo-ization” of parks and partners. A few participants commented on what they viewed as the “silo-ization” of state parks, where partnerships with State Parks are distributed. These participants found the lack of central leadership over

partnerships to be a significant challenge. This was viewed as particularly challenging for partnerships between state parks and regional or local parks.

### 3. Keys to successful partnerships (what do State Parks and partners need to do)

Associated with their descriptions of the challenges facing successful partnerships, participants also offered advice on how to ensure more success. Some suggested reference materials, like the “21 Partnership Success Factors”,<sup>1</sup> which share experiences from the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Other key recommendations included the following:

- a. No “one size fits all”. A recurrent theme from across all the workshops was that there is no single way to design and ensure a successful partnership. Different parks and different regions require different types of partnerships. Participants advised that the appropriate model for each and every partnership needs to be determined by the local state park and the potential partners involved. Several participants suggested that the best way to proceed is to identify the needs of the individual state park, then assess the strengths of each partner, and then designate roles accordingly.
- b. Shared vision. Many participants emphasized that all partners in a partnership must have a shared vision or shared goals. These participants highlighted the need to align the mission of State Parks with the mission of its partners. One participant referred to this shared vision as the “secret sauce of partnerships.”
- c. Creating “true partnerships.” Participants returned over-and-over again to the conclusion that no partnership can be successful without trusting and respectful relationships among all of the partners. This means building what some participants referred to as “true partnerships”, where each partner is empowered and has equal benefits, where coordination is consistent and communication is a “two-way street,” where partners support each other and everyone’s interests are achieved, where all partners feel a strong sense of ownership, and where accountability and transparency are built into the partnering relationship. True partnerships require expertise, investment, and commitment. Several participants cautioned here that it is nevertheless important to recognize that ultimate authority with regard to State Park decisions resides with the Department.
- d. Focus partnerships more at the local and district levels. There was a broadly held view that partnerships needed to be focused where possible at more local levels, because it is within these local-level partnerships that State Parks can be in better contact with the needs of local communities, and where State Parks can best benefit from the local expertise, capacity, energy and initiative that these local organizations can provide. Several of these participants expressed strong views that State Parks needs to involve their local partners in decisions that have local impacts.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.nps.gov/partnerships/oneill.htm>

- e. Planning, training, and leadership. Several participants commented on the upfront work needed to ensure successful partnerships. Some recommended having business or strategic plans for partnerships (both at the individual partnership level and at higher levels as well). A few suggested that training programs be developed (perhaps by philanthropic organizations) to train partners on how to operate in a State Park partnership (including information about legal restrictions placed on the rights and roles of partners). Several others commented on the importance of effective leadership within State Parks, both at the district level in proactively developing dynamic and effective relationships with local partners and at the headquarters level to provide guidance to help overcome the “silo-ization” of parks.
- f. Flexible and creative partnerships. Many participants highlighted the need for State Parks to pursue flexible and creative partnerships with both non-profits and for-profits. State Parks should encourage “out of the box” thinking. As one participant noted: “Everything can’t be by the book.”

#### 4. Potential models to learn from

Several partnerships were presented by guest speakers or referred to by members of the public as being models worthy of consideration by State Parks, although none were recommended as addressing all of State Parks partnership needs. Among the key models recommended or mentioned as noteworthy were the following:

- a. Public/private partnership model. One of the most commonly referenced public/private partnership models at the workshops was the partnership between the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) and the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy. This partnership was described as having successfully raised significant funding to support operation of the GGNRA. Along with the Presidio Trust, this partnership was also viewed as having successfully supported redevelopment of the Presidio Army Base in San Francisco.
  - i. Enterprise Model. Within the public/private partnership model, a representative of the Irvine Ranch Conservancy presented on what he described as the “Enterprise Model.” This model is founded upon the premise that partnerships should be designed to meet specific state park objectives (e.g., resource management, operation, security, visitor facilities, interpretation and outreach, research and knowledge, funding and philanthropy), and that every partner should “do what it does best” (i.e., focus on its strengths) in support of the objectives.
- b. Interagency partnership model. Participants at many of the workshops recommended that State Parks draw lessons learned from successful partnerships between public agencies. The Redwood National Park and State Parks partnership—which operates under a shared cooperating agreement—was commonly mentioned as a model for partnerships between National Parks and State Parks. Participants commended this partnership for having a shared General Plan and for pooling staff and equipment between agencies to reduce costs. Participants also mentioned partnerships between State Parks and regional parks as another possible source of inspiration and ideas. Among the

examples provided was the partnership between Mount Diablo State Park and the neighboring East Bay Regional Parks District.

- c. Cooperating Concessionaire Model. Crystal Cove State Park has a “cooperating concessionaire” partnership with the Crystal Cove Alliance, a non-profit. This partnership is relatively unique in that the non-profit partner is serving as the concessionaire for the park, and the Crystal Cove Alliance has become one of the highest grossing concessionaires in the state.
- d. Major endowment supporting a single state park. The Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation has a complete operating agreement with El Presidio de Santa Barbara State Historic Park. This agreement has been in place for over 20 years. It is a model of a major endowment supporting a single state park, and has been very successful in increasing funding for the park.

## **5. Opportunities for new partnerships**

While workshop participants did not provide many ideas for new partnerships, some suggestions were made. In general, participants advocated for increased use of partnerships, including those with local governments through the use of Joint Power Agreements (e.g., City of San Luis Obispo, Mountains Recreation Conservation Authority in Los Angeles), other public entities (e.g., UC Reserves), non-profits (including those representing user group interests such as bike riders, horseback riders, and naturalists), local industries (tourism, the hospitality sector, the film industry, and the public health/medical sector were among the most commonly mentioned). There was a general sentiment expressed at all of the workshops that State Parks could use volunteers to greater effect.



## APPENDIX A – WORKSHOP AGENDA

# Agenda

### Parks Forward Initiative Public Workshops

#### Objectives

- Learn about the Parks Forward Initiative (PFI)
- Provide public input and deepen the understanding around key issues being addressed by the Parks Forward Initiative:
  - Meeting the needs of all Californians
  - Sustainable funding
  - Effective partnerships
- Open House: Opportunity to ask questions and share views with California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks) and Parks Forward Initiative staff

#### Agenda

Time	Topic	Presenter(s)
2:45 p.m.	<i>Arrivals</i>	
3:00 p.m.	Welcome and Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome and introductions</li> <li>• Overview of workshop objectives, agenda and ground rules</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Parks Commissioners</li> <li>• Ken Wiseman, PFI Executive Director</li> <li>• Facilitator</li> </ul>
3:25 p.m.	Overview of Parks Forward Initiative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarifying questions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ken Wiseman, PFI Executive Director</li> <li>• Facilitator</li> </ul>
3:50 p.m.	Theme 1: Sustainable Funding <p><i>What should be done to ensure the long-term financial sustainability of State Parks?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduce focus questions (see below)</li> <li>• Invited guests share key perspectives on Theme 1</li> <li>• Public input on Theme 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitator</li> <li>• Invited guests</li> <li>• All</li> </ul>
4:45 p.m.	<i>Break</i>	

Time	Topic	Presenter(s)
5:00 p.m.	<p>Theme 2: Partnerships</p> <p><i>What are the opportunities for improving and/or expanding use of alternative operating arrangements that could enhance visitor experiences while improving long-term financial sustainability of State Parks?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduce focus questions (see below)</li> <li>• Invited guests share key perspectives on Theme 2</li> <li>• Public input on Theme 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitator</li> <li>• Invited guests</li> <li>• Facilitator</li> </ul>
5:50 p.m.	<p>Theme 3: Meeting the Needs of All Californians</p> <p><i>What is working well, what is not working well, and what key improvements could be made to ensure State Parks better meet the needs of all Californians in your region?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduce focus questions (see below)</li> <li>• Invited guests share key perspectives on Theme 3</li> <li>• Public input on Theme 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitator</li> <li>• Invited guests</li> <li>• All</li> </ul>
6:50 p.m.	Closing Remarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Parks Commissioners</li> <li>• Ken Wiseman, PFI Executive Director</li> </ul>
7:00 p.m.	Open House	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All</li> </ul>
7:30 p.m.	<i>Adjourn</i>	

**APPENDIX B – INVITED GUEST SPEAKERS**

<i>Location</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Themes</i>		
		<i>Meeting the Needs of All Californians</i>	<i>Financial Sustainability</i>	<i>Partnerships</i>
<b>Santa Cruz</b>	<b>September 9, 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bill Leahy - Executive Director (Big Sur Land Trust)</li> <li>• Sandy Hale – President of the Board (Point Lobos Foundation)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reed Holderman - Executive Director (Sempervirens Fund)</li> <li>• Andrew Mackenzie - General Manager (Santa Clara County Open Space Authority)</li> <li>• John Koeberer - CEO (The California Parks Company)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dave Holland - Assistant County Manager (San Mateo County Department of Parks)</li> <li>• Walter Moore - President (Peninsula Open Space Trust)</li> <li>• Bonny Hawley - Executive Director (Friends of Santa Cruz State Parks)</li> </ul>
<b>Fresno</b>	<b>September 10, 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dave Koehler - Executive Director (San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust)</li> <li>• Karlha Davies – Nature and Neighborhood Project Director (Tuolumne River Trust)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Armando Quintero - Director of Development (UC Merced/Sierra Nevada Research Institute)</li> <li>• Virginia Madueno – Consultant (Imagen Public Relations)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tom Maloney - Executive Director (Tejon Ranch Conservancy)</li> <li>• Derek Abbott - Vice President, Community Development and Resource Planning (Tejon Ranch Company)</li> </ul>
<b>San Luis Obispo</b>	<b>September 11, 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stacie Jacob - Executive Director (San Luis Obispo Visitor and Conference Bureau)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curtis Black - Deputy Director, Parks (San Luis Obispo County Parks)</li> </ul>	

<i>Location</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Themes</i>		
		<i>Meeting the Needs of All Californians</i>	<i>Financial Sustainability</i>	<i>Partnerships</i>
<b>Eureka</b>	<b>September 30, 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ryan Sundberg - Chair (Humboldt County Board of Supervisors)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tony Smithers - Executive Director (Humboldt County Visitors and Convention Bureau)</li> <li>Jeff Hedin (Team Standish Partner)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dan York - Associate Director (The Wildlands Conservancy)</li> <li>Sam Hodder - President/CEO (Save the Redwoods League)</li> <li>Dave Roemer - Chief of Resources Management and Sciences for Redwood National and State Parks (National Parks Service)</li> </ul>
<b>San Rafael</b>	<b>October 2, 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rue Mapp - Executive Director (Outdoor Afro)</li> <li>Michelle Luna - Executive Director (Stewards of the Coast and Redwoods)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bob Doyle - Executive Director (East Bay Regional Parks)</li> <li>Ron Miska - Deputy Director (Marin Co. Parks and Open Space)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Frank Dean – Superintendent of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (National Park Service)</li> <li>Greg Moore – Executive Director (Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy)</li> <li>Bill Keene - General Manager (Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District)</li> <li>Lauren Dixon – Executive Director (Parks Alliance for Sonoma County)</li> </ul>
<b>Auburn</b>	<b>October 3, 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Darla Guenzler - Executive Director (California Council of Land Trusts)</li> <li>Larry Bienati – President (Sierra State Park Foundation)</li> <li>Bill Withuhn – Curator Emeritus (Smithsonian Museum of American History)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Steve Frish - President (Sierra Business Council)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mike Conner (The Native Conservancy)</li> </ul>

<i>Location</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Themes</i>		
		<i>Meeting the Needs of All Californians</i>	<i>Financial Sustainability</i>	<i>Partnerships</i>
<b>San Diego</b>	<b>October 14, 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emily Young - Vice President of Environmental Programs, Opening the Outdoors Initiative (San Diego Foundation)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elizabeth Goldstein - President (California State Parks Foundation)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rick Barclay - Chairman (Friends of Palomar Mountain State Park)</li> <li>David McClure - President (Cuyamaca Rancho State Park Interpretive Association)</li> <li>Chuck Ross - Owner (Old Town Family Hospitality Corp)</li> </ul>
<b>Inland Empire</b>	<b>October 15, 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Charles Thomas Regional Manager, Youth Programs (National Parks Service)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dr. Jarrell Jackman – Executive Director (Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation)</li> <li>Rich Rojas- Board Member (Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation)</li> </ul>
<b>Orange County</b>	<b>October 16, 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jonno Wells, CEO (Surflife)</li> <li>Steve Long – Founder (San Onofre Foundation)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Laura Davick (Crystal Cove Alliance)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Michael O'Connell, Executive Director (Irvine Ranch Conservancy)</li> <li>Mark Denny , Chief Operating Officer (Orange County)</li> </ul>
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>October 17, 2013</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alina Bokde - Executive Director (LA Neighborhood Land Trust)</li> <li>Fabian Wagmister - Professor (REMAP UCLA)</li> <li>Lark Galloway Gilliam - Executive Director (Community Health Councils, Inc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lisa Soghor - Deputy Executive Director (Mountains Recreation Conservation Authority)</li> <li>Alfredo Gonzalez –South Coast and Deserts Region Director (The Nature Conservancy)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Russ Guiney – Director (County of LA, Department of Parks and Recreation)</li> </ul>